THEOLOGY

VOL. LIV APRIL, 1951 No. 370

Editorial

"A NATIONALL Church being a large Room," said Thomas Fuller, "it is hard to count all the Candles God lighted therein."[1] It is indeed, but there can be no doubt that Fuller himself is one of the candles that God lighted in the Church of England. No one will claim that he was a great theologian. There is only one short extract from his voluminous writings in *Anglicanism: the thought and practice of the Church of England, illustrated from the religious literature of the seventeenth century*, edited by More and Cross. But Fuller's name is more widely known and is destined to live longer than the names of most of the divines who were contemporary with him. He was a man of letters as much as he was a divine. His writings are entertaining as well as edifying. Some of them have a secure place as at any rate minor classics—*The Holy State and the Profane State*, for example, and the series which began with *Good Thoughts in Bad Times*, not to mention his *magna opera*, *The Church-History* and *The Worthies of England*.

Fuller was characteristically English in all sorts of ways, not least in his apostleship of moderation. Referring to a controversy between two ancient authorities, he wrote: "Between these two Authours, violent in Opposition, haply we may find the Truth, whose constant Dwelling-place is pleasantly seated in a moderate Vale, betwixt two swelling Extremes."[2] Yet, as the solitary extract in *Anglicanism* (No. 349) shows, he was well aware of the corruptions by which the spirit of moderation is beset and into which it may fall away. The *Via Media*, which otherwise tends to be deadly dull, becomes with Fuller as guide and monitor delightful and crowded with surprises, and at the same time conducive neither to complacency nor to pride. He did his work in a period of civil and ecclesiastical tumult, and steered his course with courage as well as with prudence. He was both a Royalist and a Puritan, and could not identify himself completely with either of the causes that divided the nation and the church.

The practical, not to say pragmatic, cast of Fuller's divinity is also characteristically English. "How well would the paines of that Minister be imployed," he said, "who should endeavour to bring downe and abate many superfluous contemplative Queries into practicall *Divinity*!"[3] Fuller is a mirror in which we may see the lights to which we should be faithful and also the limitations above which we seldom succeed in rising. He handled all matters of controversy with unfailing good humour, but sometimes with little more than

[1] *The Church History of Britain* (1655), i. 42. [2] *Church-History*, ii. 147.
[3] *The Collected Sermons of Thomas Fuller*, ed. by Bailey and Axon (1891), i. 469.

that. Still, in times of unsettlement and transition there will never be too many men who can maintain his equable temper and steady, if unimaginative, faith. He is good company in such times as these.

Anyone who has come under the spell of Fuller's writings will want to know all that can be known about the man himself. Hitherto he has not been happily served by his biographers. All the more warmly therefore we welcome Mr William Addison's *Worthy Dr Fuller*,[1] which can be recommended without reserve. He brings Fuller to life in the context of his times and contemporaries with that lightness of touch which the subject demands. At the end he compiles an alphabet of Fullerisms, of which everyone will have his favourites. Here, to conclude, are two which Mr Addison might have included, and of a kind with which nearly every page that Fuller wrote is adorned. "Pity without power will be but lame to help us; power without pity will be but deaf to hear us; whilst both together make a comfortable composition."[2] "The Controversiall Divine . . . affects clearnesse and plainnesse in all his writings. Some mens heads are like the world before God said unto it, *Fiat lux*. These dark-lanterns may shine to themselves, and understand their own conceits, but nobody else can have light from them. . . . Some affect this darknesse, that they may be accounted profound, whereas one is not bound to believe that all the water is deep that is muddy."[3]

The Evening Sacrifice

> "Admonet etiam sacrificium vespertinum ut nunquam Christum obliviscaris. Non potes oblivisci, cum lectum adscendis, ejus Domini cui in occasu diei precem fuderis, qui esurientem te sui corporis epulis expleverit."
>
> St Ambrose, *In Ps.* 118.

The two articles by the Rev. G. R. Dunstan in the January and February issues of Theology (1950) open the way to holding the view that fasting, however valuable in itself, cannot be really insisted upon as a prerequisite for Holy Communion. The conclusions that emerge from these articles and from a careful consultation of his authorities are likely, if taken seriously, to cause a number of parish priests, like myself, to consider the advisability of celebrations of the Holy Eucharist after midday on certain Sundays as a solution to the pastoral and evangelistic problems that confront us under modern conditions. Everyone knows that "Evening Communion" is an accepted practice in parishes with an "evangelical" or "central" tradition, but the evidence adduced by Dearmer and further discussed by Mr Dunstan is likely to cause churchmen of other schools of thought to think again on this matter. Many of us have been trained to believe that celebrations should be early in the

[1] J. M. Dent and Sons, 16s. [2] *A Pisgah Sight of Palestine* (1869 ed.), p. 367.
[3] *The Holy State* (1642), p 62. Though Mr Addison does not include this in his Alphabet, he quotes it elsewhere; in fact, his book is well seasoned with such quotations.

day, never later than midday, except in cases of serious hardship and then only for those people suffering from such hardships. It is true we have heard echoes of other views from time to time—someone has startled an Anglo-Catholic Congress by suggesting that, in the face of modern conditions, we should have to reconsider the position—an Anglo-Catholic country priest has introduced afternoon Masses for farm workers with a reduced fast of one or two hours—in one town parish, we hear, there is a regular Sunday evening sung Eucharist. We are also aware that the Roman Catholic Church on the Continent is allowing the practice increasingly and that there are papal dispensations relaxing the rigour of the fast in certain respects. But we have continued to regard fasting as an essential and "Evening Communion" as an unfortunate deviation from Catholic practice. Therefore, we begin to consider this possible solution with distaste, but are forced to do so by the situation which confronts us in several types of parish. There is, first of all, the derelict parish taken over by a man who is not content to allow it to remain so. He finds an order of things representing the influence of the Cambridge Ecclesiologists with a dash of late Tractarianism. There is an 8 o'clock Low Celebration attended by a pathetically small group of devout souls on all Sundays save Easter and possibly Christmas. Matins is elaborately and badly sung with a choir and congregation of, mainly, young people and children (the result of heroic efforts of a former vicar to inculcate a habit of morning church-going through the Sunday school). His biggest congregation will be at Evensong, and he will find that, as a result of strenuous pastoral efforts, what people he will win back to the Church will come then because there is a strong tradition of evening church-going. The encouragement he feels in getting these people to come to church at all will be tempered by disappointment because they seem to get no nearer to returning to or beginning a *communicant* life in the Church. If he has a mission church he will find that Holy Communion is a monthly affair attended again by the few when it is celebrated, but that as Evensong has been held every Sunday, because it has always been comparatively easy to get a lay-reader to take it, this has come to be looked upon as "the ordinary service" and the Eucharist as an Occasional Office for the superdevout.

In such a parish the vicar will find himself up against wellnigh insuperable obstacles of a sociological nature if he wishes to get his people back to the altar, so long as the Holy Communion is invariably in the morning. He is likely to find, if he introduces a parish Communion or sung Eucharist at 9, 9.30, or 11 a.m., that the younger generation will respond to it with enthusiasm and that they will be accompanied by some adults. He will be interested to note that doing this will at once increase the number of communicants,[1] which suggests that the early morning service has been discouraging would-be communicants for years in spite of strong and regular insistence on the duty of frequent Communion by his predecessors. But he will

[1] Unless, of course, he makes it a "High Mass" and discourages communion.

still find that the most popular service is Evensong, and he will fail to achieve the main object of the liturgical movement—namely, the restoration of the Lord's Supper, the essential Christian Liturgy, to its proper place as the main service regularly attended by a representative majority of his people. He may find it easier at a mission church. The "High Matins" and "High Evensong" tradition has become so firmly rooted in most parish churches that it nearly always blocks or deflects the urge towards a "family" Eucharist, but in mission churches, which are usually quite recent foundations, this is not so to anything like the same extent, and it is comparatively easy to bring about an almost complete change-over from Evensong to parish Communion. I have seen it done in less than a year in a very "difficult" parish.

Secondly, there is the type of parish which has never been derelict and which has long succeeded in outgrowing the Camden Society standards. It has always been alive and well attended. There is a regular sung Eucharist in the morning, an 8 o'clock said Mass, and Evensong. Both the 8 o'clock and the sung Eucharist are well attended, but here again it will probably be found that the biggest congregation will be in the evening. There will be those who come at 8, some every Sunday, some once a month, some less frequently. There will be those who come to the parish Communion or sung Eucharist every Sunday. If there is a sung Matins in addition there will be a group who patronize that. There will be those who only come to Evensong, except on great festivals, but on most Sundays most of the people from all these groups will be at church in the evening. Many clergy are quite happy about this state of affairs, but some of us are not. It seems dangerously like that at Corinth at one time in St Paul's career. The people might say: "I am of the 8 o'clock; I of the sung Eucharist; I of Matins; I of Evensong." Liturgically, at any rate, there are divisions among them.

The third type of parish is that in which by far the best attended service is the morning parish Eucharist with an 8 o'clock for a minority who cannot come later, and where Evensong is regarded as an additional service, though it may be quite well attended. No one can doubt the strength and attractiveness of the liturgical and spiritual life of such a parish. It is a tonic to visit or work in one, but quite often this has been achieved over a long period of years as a result of a determined effort to "smash" Evensong. It has left a number of spiritual casualties on the road and driven a number of people to worship away from the parish or to lapse altogether. Still worse, in some parishes of this type, it has produced a "practising Catholic" majority with a disgruntled "protestant" minority. In any case, in the first two types of parish, a process of "sabotaging" Evensong will have to be initiated if the incumbent is going to have much chance of building up a representative congregation at a parish Eucharist.

Now, is it really right or necessary to embark on a deliberate policy of destroying a tradition of evening church-going? It may well be so if that tradition involves the substitution of a Choir

Office, however beautiful, dignified, and scriptural, for the Lord's Supper, *the* Liturgy, the "People's Work". But need it go on involving this? In other words, what about evening Masses?

It is such reasoning as this that leads one seriously to consider the matter, but there are also the sociological factors already referred to. It is to be questioned if all clergymen are sufficiently aware of them.[1] It is futile to expend a great deal of time and trouble in evangelistic efforts when the hoped-for response is already impossible for large sections of the population who are prevented from attendance at a Sunday morning service by Sunday work—agricultural workers, milkmen, railwaymen, bus and lorry drivers, and many others. Moreover, though not impossible, it is exceedingly difficult for mothers of young children to leave the house at all before the afternoon.[2] It seems that the evangelistic forces released by the Liturgical Movement are being held back by a barrier labelled "Morning fasting Communion only". True, many people have overcome these obstacles and not been daunted by this barrier, but there are many "weaker brethren" who have not. The situation leads one to look at the Patristic evidence afresh. If one is certain that the unbroken practice of the Catholic Church since the time of the Apostles has been morning fasting Communion, then the only way is to go on battering away at the Sunday evening tradition and struggling, usually vainly, to overcome the sociological difficulties. But if there is any evidence that the morning tradition has not always been universal, then a strong case for evening Eucharists emerges. One therefore goes to the ancient authorities hoping to find the door ajar, and *mirabile dictu* finds it wide open!—wide open, that is to say, if, as I have always supposed, the basis of the Anglican ethos is an appeal to Scripture and the practice of the Primitive Church, rather than to the Middle Ages. Dearmer's book is an attack on fasting in general and on fasting-communion in particular. References to evening Eucharists are oblique and secondary. It impresses one as a tendentious book—a reaction against something, but when one allows for that, the evidence remains and the main contention, as Mr Dunstan maintains, has never been effectively refuted. After checking the references and comparing with other authorities, the most likely theory seems to be that the practice of the Church up to the fourth century was an evening Eucharist following the Agape. Dearmer makes it impossible to take the letter of Pliny as evidence for a morning Eucharist, and it seems to be the only link between the New Testament and St Augustine, whom one finds (once one reads *him* rather than Gratian or St Thomas Aquinas) defending the practice of having the Eucharist *before* supper but *after* lunch, as is the practice of the African Church. St Ambrose one finds taking an evening Eucharist for granted.

[1] Consultation of Mass Observation's valuable little book *See Yourself on Sunday* might help here.

[2] Communion from the Reserved Sacrament would prevent these people being deprived of Communion, but it would not solve the liturgical and evangelistic problems.

For my own part, I find myself constantly reverting to the pastoral and evangelistic aspect. It is difficult enough to get people into church nowadays, but having got them there we often lose them again, and, if we keep them, it is often as "Anglican non-conformists", since it is to Evensong they come because Sunday evening is the traditional time for church-going. The whole Gospel may be preached to them when they get there, but are sermons sufficient, however eloquent, unless the Gospel is also *enacted* before them? The Calvinists call the Lord's Supper an "acted Word", and they may not be so far wrong. Methodists claim they believe in the Real Presence by referring to the Wesleyan doctrine that the Eucharist is a "converting ordinance".[1] May they not be right to this extent, that the liturgical action of the Eucharist can and does "convert" those who witness it. In this connexion I find it significant to hear Anglo-Catholics defending non-liturgical uses of the Blessed Sacrament because of their proven evangelistic effect. The point surely is that people are more likely to come to church on Sunday evenings, and those who so come are more likely to say "the Lord is among you indeed" if they find a Eucharist going on than a Choir Office or even a "Mission Service".

The phrase "Evening Communion" is one I wish to avoid as much as possible, and that not only because it has unpleasant controversial associations and has become a kind of "standard" of a certain ecclesiastical party,[2] but also because it usually means a "low" celebration *after* a decidedly "high" Evensong, which is something quite different from what is really needed. As such it is an anti-climax, something a few odd people "stay behind" for and which is in addition to the usual Sunday services. Moreover, however strong the argument may be for evening Masses, anything like a landslide from the morning tradition would probably not be a good thing at the present time. But there do seem to be strong arguments for trying out the following kind of experiment in the first two types of parish mentioned above.

There would be an evening sung Eucharist on one Sunday of the month at 6 or 6.30 p.m. which would take the place of the usual morning sung Eucharist. The co-operation of organist, choir, servers, and a majority of the congregation, would be essential. The service would be used by the priest as an opportunity for *demonstrating* the Liturgy, and he would have to use his discretion about the amount of ceremonial used and would be well advised to base his sermon upon, or illustrate it by, some part or aspect of the liturgical action. It would be of first importance that the service should be

[1] See E. G. Rupp in *The Holy Communion: a Symposium* (S.C.M. Press), p. 116. Of course, the argument in the form the Methodists give it is partly vitiated for Anglicans, for what they really mean is that a man can be converted by making his Communion, whereas we are bound, I should have thought, to insist that Communion is the *result* of conversion, not its *means*. One has to bear in mind, however, the emotional and pietistic conception of conversion held by Methodists.

[2] Though, actually, it was a "High" Churchman, Hook of Leeds, who first introduced "Evening Communion", as it has been known in recent times.

sung, even if this only meant the singing of the Creed and Gloria.[1] Evensong whether said or sung would *follow*[2] the Eucharist: Although such a service would provide the opportunity for many to communicate who could not do so in the morning, the success of such an experiment should not be judged by the number of communicants at this service alone, but rather by its general effect on the parish over a considerable length of time—say six months or a year. Attendance at a morning Eucharist might be urged at this time as a yet more excellent way, and no one deeply wedded to the morning tradition should be made to feel disloyal if they attended without communicating. Obviously fasting communion in its strict traditional sense could not be insisted upon, but the spiritual advantages usually achieved by it might be gained in other ways—e.g., by a greater emphasis on the keeping of the Prayer Book Fasts, that is, Fridays, Vigils, etc., and the suggestion that these might be made with the intention of preparing for the Sunday Communion following them. Also, people might well be encouraged to let their Sunday dinner be the last food before communicating at an evening Mass, or to limit any refreshment after dinner and before Mass to liquids only. This would be a similar line to that resulting from the papal dispensations for evening Communion on the Continent. The vital thing seems to be to get people back to the altar first and *then* teach them about fasting. Many churchmen have always believed wholeheartedly in fasting Communion, but have also never lost sight of the fact that it is fundamentally a *devotion* and have never been able to share the mentality of those who appear to hold that fasting has some necessary and direct bearing on the worthiness of any single act of communion.

In discussing such an experiment with other clergy one finds oneself confronted by three schools of thought—viz.: (*a*) Those who take the view that it would be a serious deviation from Catholic practice and, in fact, a defiance of Canon Law. Though evening Masses may have been common in pre-Nicene times and fasting communion not insisted upon then, both have been an almost universal rule and custom ever since, except in times of neglect of the sacrament (e.g., during the eighteenth century, *sic*), and, moreover, Anglicans are bound by Canon Law except where it has been definitely abrogated in the 1604 Canons, and this means we are bound by such Councils as the Lateran Council of 1215 and the Council of Constance of 1415 to insist on fasting Communion. Moreover, the tradition of morning fasting Communion has been revived and con-

[1] However much may be said of the quiet, devout prayerfulness of the Anglican Low Mass as an occasional *extra* service, if it is the only kind of celebration in a parish and if it contrasts too obviously, by being said, with a sung Choir Office, it tends to produce a pietistic individualism. The Eucharist is not only, or even mainly, an opportunity for individual devotion. This can be done at any time and is surely what is intended by the words "Feed on him in your heart by faith with thanksgiving".

[2] The Prayer Book order ought to be preserved. Dearmer speaks of the harm done to the balance of the Anglican Liturgy by the reversal of the order of Matins and Holy Communion. One does not wish to make a similar mistake at the end of the day.

solidated in the Church of England over the last seventy years, with rich results in devotion and discipline. Nothing should be done to endanger this. More discipline, not less, is needed in the Church to-day when laxity is so prevalent. (*b*) Those who do not find themselves able to maintain that there is any fundamental theological or canonical reason for not having evening Eucharists, but feel that custom has sanctified the morning rule, and who think that, in any case, no individual incumbent should act on his own authority in the matter, but should refer it to the bishop. (*c*) Those who have never had any doubts about evening Communion being both permissible and advisable where conditions demand it. This group feel impatience with what they regard as the legalism of group (*a*) and the intransigence of group (*b*). From this last group one hears the authentic voice of the best kind of evangelical thought in a longing to bring people to our Lord and to his Supper which produces an unwillingness to allow anything to stand in the way, however much it may rest upon tradition and ecclesiastical authority.

In answer to the objections of the first school, it may be pleaded that, apart from the traditional Anglican appeal to Scripture and the Primitive Church, the basis of Canon Law is custom.[1] No less a person than Archbishop William Temple has said that the approximation of Canon Law to Statute Law was a tragedy.[2] Evening Eucharists have been common in the Church of England for many years. No bishop would take it upon himself to forbid them on such grounds. It is significant that the Prayer Book, which retains most of the traditional fast days and penitential seasons, is silent about fasting before Communion, and that the Homily of Fasting, though setting a high standard with regard to fasting in general, makes no mention of it, nor the one on the Worthy Receiving of the Sacrament. The most one can get out of the Anglican witness, Caroline divines, Jeremy Taylor *et hoc genus omne*, is that it is a "laudable and ancient custom" to be commended but not insisted upon. As for being bound by these Councils, it would be as well to remember that they simultaneously enacted many other things which no reasonable person would insist upon to-day; and, if we are going to be fussy about Canon Law, it is an odd thing that the same school of thought which suspects evening Eucharists on these grounds, tends to discourage communicants at a late morning Mass which is, quite certainly, contrary to Anglican Canon Law. Again, it is odd that certain Anglicans would be stricter about Canon Law with regard to this matter when the Popish Church, actually bound to all the details of the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, can see her way to allowing increasingly evening Masses with a view to evangelism—precisely the object in view in this proposal.[3] No one can deny and no one wants

[1] See Introduction to the Report on Canon Law *passim*, but especially p. 146.

[2] Quoted from "Standing Orders in the Church of England: an Attempt to state what Canon Law is now in force", by Hudson and Dewar in *Christian Morals*.

[3] It is interesting to note that the present prevalent nonconformist practice of evening Communion is a change from original Protestant practice (see Charles Harris in *Liturgy and Worship*, esp. p. 572). Have the nonconformists made the

to minimize the rich spiritual dividends that have accrued as a result of the revival of early morning fasting Communion, but the fact remains that communicants have not increased over the last seventy years, but rather the opposite,[1] and there has been a tendency for an eclectic, disciplined coterie to grow up in each parish whose "Catholicism" contrasts with the customs of the broader masses of the people. One must agree that more, not less, discipline is needed, and it is no lowering of standards that is advocated here. Surely it is a deplorably low standard that in a given parish the regular communicants are a minority and that there is a considerable minority of "churchpeople" who never communicate at all? This is the "camel"; failure to receive the Sacrament on an empty stomach, the "gnat". Would it not be as well to consider that we may have put the cart before the horse, that discipline should be the fruit rather than the prerequisite of Holy Communion?

Those in group (*b*) do not seem really to have an arguable case, except for a reasonable degree of caution before rushing into novel experiments. As for asking the bishop's permission, it seems doubtful, in view of what has already been said, that any English bishop nowadays has the right either to forbid or enforce evening Eucharists in principle.

One feels over the third group (*c*), while admiring their evangelistic fervour, that they are inclined to give insufficient weight to tradition and church authority. Any such weight of authority against evening Masses should make anyone hesitate, for unchecked individualism is as bad an enemy of the Gospel as ecclesiastical rigorism. There is always a danger of allowing a merely "popular" religion to grow up, with no staying power and backbone, and against this respect for tradition and Canon Law is a safeguard. Too much emphasis is probably laid on fasting preparation for Communion and too little on other kinds of fasting. Many people who would never dream of receiving the Sacrament after other food or eating a shred of meat on Fridays completely ignore Rogation Days, Ember Days, and Vigils. In this it appears that the Book of Common Prayer is more primitive than the traditional "Western Catholic" view, as it also is in not making a clear distinction between fasting and abstinence. Would it not be more sensible for parish priests to teach their people to keep the traditional fast days *parsimonia victus abstinentiaque ciborum*, in the manner of the Primitive Church,

change for evangelistic and pastoral reasons? It seems likely. Also I note that on 15 October 1950 there was a celebration of the Orthodox Liturgy at a church in Clapham at *3 p.m.* for the benefit of scattered eastern European d.p.s who have to come from long distances. One would like to know what view about evening Eucharists would be taken by Eastern Orthodox authorities.

[1] *Frequent* communion seems to have been the primitive norm (see Srawley and Dix, etc.). Infrequent Communion has been the rule everywhere, apparently, from the fifth century until the time of the Liturgical Movement. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the change from the primitive norm was in fact a result of the change to morning fasting Communion. It would surely be true to say that we have, now, in the Church of England, as compared, say, with any age prior to the Evangelical Revival, more people who communicate *frequently*, but fewer people who communicate *at all*.

rather than to suggest to them that there is something peculiarly pleasing to God in a technically empty stomach before Holy Communion? Many churchmen may specify, as a warning, the prevalent misuse of the midnight Mass on Christmas Eve (really an evening celebration), which causes so much concern to conscientious parish priests, but a regular monthly evening Eucharist, never held on great festivals, would lack the rather meretricious glamour that tends to surround the Christmas midnight Mass and which is probably the main cause of this misuse.

To conclude, it seems that the principle of the thing is this. Holy Communion is a sacrament universally necessary to salvation, as is Baptism. We *must* bring our people to partake in it. We can, therefore, as with Baptism, insist only on the absolute minimum of prerequisites. In Baptism it seems, following the last Lambeth Conference resolution on the subject, that one communicant godparent and an attempt to make sure of some modicum of justifying faith on the part of the parents and/or godparents by instruction beforehand is all we can demand, though many clergy (who would, however, fence the *altar* much more strictly) would require nothing but the fact that the parents were desirous of bringing the child to the Font as sufficient evidence of a right intention.

Now let us apply to Holy Communion what we already apply to Holy Baptism. Willingness to come to Holy Communion with any degree of regularity is far more likely to be a sign of right faith nowadays than willingness to bring a child to Baptism is for that sacrament, because the former involves a definite coming forward to do an unfashionable thing, while the latter is far more the "done thing", a social convention—almost, some would say, a popular superstition. Faith is one of the minimum conditions for Holy Communion. The others are penitence, a right intention, and being in love and charity with all men. The first of these is assured by the form of Confession and Absolution in the rite itself.[1] The other two can come only by the exhortation and teaching of the priest, whether he has Mass in the morning or in the evening. Have we any right to insist, in addition, upon fasting, a willingness to get up early on Sunday mornings, to alter and disrupt domestic routine, and to go against a strong, but not bad, social tradition?

M. E. Dahl.

Christianity and Freemasonry

When it is remembered that very many of the most respected of our leaders to-day consider themselves honoured to be numbered

[1] That is, of course, if it is rightly emphasized in the teaching. There is a tendency in parishes of a more or less definite "Catholic" tradition so to emphasize private auricular confession that the suggestion is made that the General Confession and Absolution in the rite is not really a proper part of the Ministry of Reconciliation at all. See Max Warren's comment in his book *Strange Victory* on the words from the Exhortation "That by the ministry of God's Holy Word he may receive benefit of absolution", which he links up with the Comfortable Words.

amongst Freemasons, Mr Hannah's attack upon the fraternity in the January number of THEOLOGY seems scandalous.

A great deal that Mr Hannah writes suggests foolish mummery. A few minutes' reflection upon some of the great names, great in every walk of life, who have been proud to be Freemasons, ought to suggest to everybody that the Craft cannot be the futile thing which he suggests it is. But, lest that conviction should gain ground, Mr Hannah hastily takes another line. It is both futile *and* deadly. It is a damnable heresy, a mystery religion, a revival of gnosticism, an attempt to destroy Christianity. But, of course, not many of its adherents understand its true character. Few attempt to strip away the veils which hide its reality. Most take it at its face value and enjoy dressing up and indulging in puerile ceremonies. Once again glance at the names of some of the great men who have ranged themselves under the banner of Freemasonry. Was Isaac Newton a nitwit? And Christopher Wren? Was Frederick the Great a feeble playboy? But those were men who lived long ago. Yes, but search and see. It will be found that some of the most distinguished men of every generation have been Freemasons, and our own is no exception. How unpardonable it is to suggest that a society, well known for its public charity, can be composed only of fools or knaves!

With respect to the lighter side of masonry Mr Hannah has been too credulous. With regard to its serious side, too clever. He has read a number of books, which do, in fact, suggest that Freemasonry has some affinity with the mystery religions, but he has not understood what he has read. For, just as there are anthropologists who try to prove that Christianity itself, and especially on its sacramental side, is derived from mystery religions, so are there scholars who do the same for the Craft. What Mr Hannah has failed to understand is that there are three different kinds of Freemasonry. Between them there is a greater gulf than that which used to separate Jews from Gentiles. Sometimes even orthodox masonic writers play with the ideas of the other two systems, in much the same way that a Christian like Dr James will use some of the theories of *The Golden Bough*. Mr Hannah does not know enough about his subject to distinguish between orthodox, heterodox, and "tentative" authors.

The three bodies among which Freemasons are divided may be called Regular, Continental, and Theosophical. The Continental Freemasons are organized under Grand Orients and are political, atheistical, and bitterly anti-clerical. They are spread over all the world, but more especially in Latin countries. There are a few, but very few, Regular Masons in these countries also. Theosophical masonry acquired importance largely through the work of Mrs Besant. It comprehends such bodies as the Star in the East and the Rosicrucians (not to be confounded with the Rose Croix). It admits women to full membership. It attempts a synthesis of religions. Regular Freemasons are organized under Grand Lodges, which are independent of one another, but, nevertheless, are bound to the Grand Lodge of England, or the Grand Lodge of Scotland, in much the same way that the Dominions are linked to Great Britain.

Regular Freemasons are found all over the world, except that, possibly, they do not practise to-day behind the Iron Curtain. They are fanatically non-political and maintain firmly that belief in God is the great foundation of the masonic system. They refuse all co-operation and fellowship with both Continental and Theosophical masons, so much so that any Regular Mason who was known to have attended a lodge of either of the other groups would have his name struck off the register of his Grand Lodge.

Into the curious details which Mr Hannah gives about ceremonial it is not necessary to go. It is not possible to deny some of his imaginings without seeming to vouch for the truth of others, thus being unfaithful to masonic obligation. The scales are heavily weighed in any argument of this kind in Mr Hannah's favour. He can say what he likes and describe what he likes, and he must be allowed to get away with it. This kind of attack by ridicule upon things uncongenial, or misunderstood, is very easy and has often been made. The "mingle-mangle, mumpsing, and hocus-pocus" jests of the Puritans about sacramental worship are cases in point.

Although it is not possible to consider Mr Hannah's descriptions in detail, I can join issue with him about some of the more important principles which he raises. First, there is the question of a Freemason's oath. It must be borne in mind that no one is compelled, persuaded, or even asked to become a Freemason. The institution does not actively recruit new members. Indeed, every candidate has to declare on his honour that no pressure has been put upon him by his friends, nor has he been enticed to come forward by mercenary or any other unworthy motive, but that he freely and voluntarily offers himself as a candidate. Then he solemnly undertakes that he will never say or do anything which might disclose to non-masons the secrets of the Order. If he should break this promise he acknowledges that he would deserve certain punishments. I pass over the fact that Mr Hannah has not got these right. The point is of no importance. But what does matter is that the deserved penalties all concern this life. There is no wickedness in saying to a friend, "If I do so-and-so you can knock me down. It will serve me right." The Freemason does not say "I swear by God" or "I take God to witness" or "as I hope for eternal salvation". What, in effect, he says is, "If you will let me into your society and share with me your secrets, then I solemnly undertake to be worthy of your confidence and never improperly to divulge what you tell me. If I do, then you may punish me. I shall deserve it." Then he proves that his promise is to be taken seriously by praying to God to enable him to keep it faithfully. Strictly speaking the obligation is not a vow at all. What fantastic nonsense it is to say that it violates Christian principles!

The question of the restoration of a candidate to light is equally absurd. Mr Hannah would have us believe that the Craft teaches that all Christians are in a state of darkness until they receive the blessing of masonic light. To every candidate the question is put, "In all cases of difficulty and danger in whom do you put your trust?" The candidate must answer "In God". If he cannot, or will

not, he is rejected. Is it not obvious that a man who can give the required answer to that question has already attained to a very considerable spiritual light? The light of masonry is not in conflict with the light of religion. It is something peculiar to itself, and there I must leave the matter.

By far the most serious of the charges which in his ignorance Mr Hannah brings against Freemasonry are concerned with the doctrine of God. First, he accuses the fraternity of being indifferent to the nature and character of God, and then he goes on to maintain that it has a peculiar God of its own. He is right when he says that Regular masonry demands faith in God as a necessary condition of membership. "But", says he, "any kind of God will do. If a man believes in Allah, or Krishna, or Jehovah, he is as welcome as one who believes in the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." That also is true, but the deduction which Mr Hannah goes on to make is wholly wrong. Freemasonry insists on a belief in God because it holds that if men do not believe in one, and in a future life, they can have no trustworthy standard of life, or code of morals. They can have no real sanctions or values. Expediency must be their only rule. But, when once belief in God is affirmed, no further inquiry is necessary for masonic purposes. It is absolutely true that there is nothing in Freemasonry which conflicts with any man's religious beliefs or duties. Every Freemason believes, and he is expected to believe, in his own God and should strive to obey his commands. That is why the Volume of the Sacred Law open in lodge may be a Bible, or a Koran, or any book which members accept as containing the revelation of the will of him whom they worship. That is why they may all be open together. As is his custom, Mr Hannah misinterprets this. It is not because Masons think that "all gods are equally good and all bibles equally true". It is because they expect that every Mason will believe that the God whom he worships is the true God, and because they respect one another's religious convictions. The Great Architect of the Universe I know to be the Blessed Trinity in Unity. My neighbour may believe that he is Allah, or Shiva, or whom you will. We allow no religious controversy in lodge, but each worships him in whom he believes, and we speak of him by symbolic titles, which we all believe are true in themselves, and which we know are common to us all. We are convinced that it is right that, in this divided and suffering world, men of different creeds should be able to come together on the common platform of faith in a supreme Ruler and Judge of the world, in order that they may work for unity and peace amongst men, encourage brotherhood, and engage in charity.

It would not be true to say that masonry has no doctrine of God at all. It most certainly teaches that God is not just the First Cause or merely a "force". For Freemasons he is personal. He is the Great Architect of the Universe, who created all things as he willed. He is the Grand Geometrician, an idea not far from that of Jeans, who says that creation looks to him like a mathematical thought. He is the Most High. He is absolute holiness and justice. But what is

there in these ideas that need frighten a Christian? Are they not true? Does the fact that Hindus and Parsees agree that they are true make them heretical, or dangerous? Because Jews hold them, are they impossible for a Christian?

It is when he reaches the Royal Arch that Mr Hannah touches the summit of his futility. For then, dropping the accusation of indifference, he accuses Freemasonry of being a revival of gnostic heresy and of attempting to undermine Christianity. It presents for the adoration of its initiates an idea of God which is derived from the pagan religions of antiquity. But are Christians bound to believe that there was nothing but falsehood in paganism and that preparation for the Incarnation was confined to the Jews? Are they bound to believe, in fact, that God did leave himself without witness amongst the heathen? If so, then St Paul was sadly misled. What does the Royal Arch really teach? That God is one, eternal, unchanging, transcendent, self-existent, the Lord and Ruler of all creation, the righteous Judge of all flesh, the universal Father, who is to be approached by his creatures only with the very deepest reverence. What is there here to which any Christian, any Catholic, need take exception? Is not the God of Christian worship "the true and living God most high"? I agree, with all my heart, that this does not include the full revelation of God, but does it not afford a perfectly legitimate meeting-place from which men who hold it may start off together to perform works of charity? Although such a foundation of mutual belief is not the best that can be imagined, it is surely as worthy of respect as the "mutual funk" which would seem to be the basis of the United Nations. But I have not yet heard anyone denounce that institution as anti-Christian! Must we wait until Muslims and Hindus and Parsees have accepted God's manifestation of himself in the Incarnation before we can join with them to ameliorate the lot of the widow and the orphan? Is it wrong to pray with them to God when we are engaged in organizing works of mercy and pity? The Pope says it is—but then, not long ago, he told his subjects that it was wrong for them to say the Our Father with separated Christians who were longing and praying for the restoration of Christian unity. Did we Anglicans approve of that?

Christianity, we are often told, is an exclusive religion. It can never equate itself with others, for it is the custodian of the Good News, the final and complete revelation of God to this world. I agree. It is not the best of religions; it is the *only* true religion. But that does not compel Christians to deny that there are elements of truth in most religions, and it does not mean that it is wrong for them to have friendly intercourse with Samaritans and other neighbours, who have not yet been led to realize the truth as it is in Jesus. At least, not so have I learned Christ. The world in which we live is darkened by fears, greeds, hatreds, and ambitions. The only true light in our darkness is our Lord and Saviour. But because of our divisions and strifes and blindnesses not all can see him. Freemasonry is trying to build a neutral platform on which men of very different loyalties can meet and learn to know and respect one another and

engage in Christ-like charity. It is not hiding the light of Christ or substituting anything for him. On the contrary by trying to promote mutual understanding it is hastening the day of his triumph. That is how any Christian, who really believes his religion, should judge.

As a matter of fact Freemasonry contains in its own system a great deal more than a suggestion that God cannot be perfectly known until he is seen in Christ. Mr Hannah mentions, but shies away from, the question of the Higher Degrees. Well he may, for they destroy his contentions. They are "Freemasonry"; they are built up on the craft degrees, but no one is allowed to proceed to them who cannot profess that he believes in the Blessed Trinity. The Higher Degrees are completely Christian and orthodox.

But Rome has spoken out loudly about the evil of Freemasonry. She is in direct contact and conflict with Continental masonry, and it is largely through her own action that the Grand Orients have become so hostile to religion. She knows very little about Regular masonry. Rome condemns any religious or quasi-religious organization of which she has not complete control. She is an autocracy, and all autocrats, such as Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin, have prohibited the Craft. Dictators cannot bear any limitation to their authority, which accounts for the persecution of religion, as well as Freemasonry, behind the iron curtain, and the Roman Catholic ban on united prayer. Scoutmasters know that Rome's attitude is by no means invariably helpful. Rotary has lately been banned—why it is hard to say, for it is little more than a luncheon club, which tries to promote international friendship and understanding between different classes and professions. It has no religious platform at all.

At present Regular Freemasonry is not a separate religion, or a schism, withdrawing men from the Church into its organization. So far from doing that, it exhorts its members to discharge faithfully the duties of the particular religion to which they belong. But there are hostile forces contending for its soul. There are men, even in England, who regret its religious side and would like it destroyed so that Grand Lodges and Grand Orients could work together. There are others who really hold the gnostic doctrines which Mr Hannah attributes to Regular Freemasonry. There are men who would make it into a new religion. At the present moment the Grand Lodges will have nothing at all to do with them, but anything like an official condemnation of the fraternity would play directly into the hands of the destructive elements. That very thing happened on the Continent. It was the papal ban which changed Grand Lodges into Grand Orients, and made them the bitter enemies of the Church which they are to-day. God forbid that that should happen in England. The way to prevent it is not to ostracize it, but for priests and devout laymen to come into it and keep it from being captured by the enemies of true religion. Is it worth while? Freemasonry, beyond doubt, is one of the most alive institutions in the world to-day. Its growth is phenomenal. New Lodges are being chartered by the Grand Lodge of England alone at the rate of over one hundred a year. Why should we drive this enthusiastic body of men into the

arms of the devil and convert a society, which to-day is one of the most highly organized powers that exists for good, into the enemy of the Church?

I am a Catholic and a priest. If I believed that Freemasonry compromised either my allegiance to my Saviour, or my loyalty to his Church, I would drop it as I would a rattlesnake. But I know that it does not and I know what I am talking about.

J. L. C. Dart.

Great Preachers—IV. Charles Simeon

The life of Charles Simeon is so well known as to call for only the briefest summary here. Born in 1759, he was educated at Eton and then at King's College, Cambridge, of which he was a scholar and, later, Fellow. He was made deacon in 1782, and priest in the following year. That same year he preached for the first time at Holy Trinity Church, Cambridge, where he remained till his death in 1836. Thrice he was one of the deans of King's, its second bursar from 1798 to 1805, and its Vice-provost from 1790 to 1792. Of his share in the founding of the Church Missionary Society and of his support of the British and Foreign Bible Society nothing need here be said. Of his influence it must suffice to give two quotations, the first from Bishop Charles Wordsworth (*Annals of my Early Life*, p. 335): Simeon "had a large following of young men—larger and not less devoted than that which followed Newman—and for a much longer time." The second quotation comprises the well-known words of Lord Macaulay, son of Zachary Macaulay, who was a friend of Simeon. He wrote (*Life of Lord Macaulay*, i. 67, note): "As to Simeon, if you knew what his authority and influence were, and how they extended from Cambridge to the most remote corners of England, you would allow that his real sway over the Church was far greater than that of any Primate."

Few would dispute Simeon's right to a place even in a short list of great preachers. But wherein, precisely, lay his greatness as a preacher? The answer cannot be found simply in the length of his ministry in one place, remarkable though that was; nor in the strategic position which the incumbent of Holy Trinity Church, Cambridge, inevitably occupies; nor even in the immense volume of printed work which issued from his study, and which we have now in the twenty-one stout volumes of his *Horae Homileticae*, comprising 2,536 sermons, in regard to which Simeon at the end of his Preface wrote optimistically: ". . . if the Reader peruse *one discourse every day of his life*, the whole will occupy him exactly *seven years*." These facts, weighty though they are, do not go deep enough to explain his greatness.

For the sake of clarity and conciseness, we may suggest five factors which must be taken into consideration.

The *first* and most important factor was *the man himself*. Contemporary prints show us a man of obviously strong character, with prominent nose and determined chin. Indeed, for the major part of

his life he fought a battle with his temper. But the portrait of him, taken at the age of 49, which is now in King's College, and a reproduction of which serves as a frontispiece to H. C. G. Moule's *Life* (1892 edition), shows a face marked by a combination of strength and sweetness which is singularly attractive and in part explains the extraordinary hold which he exercised over graduates and undergraduates, over "town" and "gown", for a long period of years. The circumstances of his conversion while an undergraduate at King's are well known. In that Passion week of 1779, and especially on that Easter Sunday morning when he "awoke early with those words upon my heart and lips, 'Jesus Christ is risen to-day! Hallelujah! Hallelujah!'", forces were liberated in Charles Simeon's soul which were never to cease operating till his death fifty-seven years later. Literally to his dying day he retained a sense of his deep unworthiness and of his utter indebtedness to the God who in Christ had redeemed him.

"No man who is too proud to be infinitely in debt will ever be a Christian." So J. S. Stewart has written (*A Man in Christ*, p. 224). This realization was the *fons et origo* of Simeon's greatness as a preacher. For it must be remembered that the sermon, as distinct from the lecture or the essay, consists quite as much in what the preacher *is* as in what he *says*. That is why preaching is so searching and humbling and sometimes terrifying a task.

The quality of his preaching was but a reflection of the quality of the man himself. And there can be little doubt that the man himself was largely made in the early morning hours which he devoted to private prayer and the devotional study of the Scriptures. It was his custom to rise at 4 a.m., light his own fire, and then devote the first four hours of the day to communion with God. Such costly self-discipline made the preacher. That was primary. The making of the sermon was secondary and derivative.

The *second* factor was *the clarity of his aim*. Simeon in his preface to the *Horae Homileticae* (I, xxi) writes: "The Author . . . would wish his Work to be brought to this test—Does it uniformly tend

To HUMBLE THE SINNER?
To EXALT THE SAVIOUR?
To PROMOTE HOLINESS?

If in one single instance it lose sight of any of these points, let it be condemned without mercy. . . ." That is strong language. But it cannot be denied that the possession of such an aim saves preaching from that "desultoriness" which characterizes so many so-called sermons which in actual fact consist of a few "nice thoughts" loosely strung together. Preachers of such sermons might have inscribed on their tomb-stones the lines:

I shot an arrow into the air;
It fell to earth I know not where.

Of Simeon this could never be said. He knew what he aimed at. Judging by the throngs which filled his church, by the scores of

undergraduates who came week by week to his "conversation parties" in his drawing-room at King's, and by the world-wide influence of those who went out from Cambridge during his life-time to chaplaincies abroad and incumbencies at home, his sermons found their mark—sinners were humbled, the Saviour was exalted, holiness was promoted. Whatever language we in the twentieth century might prefer to use, it would be difficult to improve on Simeon's test of the main purpose of preaching.

The *third* factor was *the range of his themes.* By this I do not mean to suggest that the range of Simeon's sermon subjects was as encyclopedic as is that of some twentieth-century preachers. (Parenthetically let it be hinted that this may not be so much a criticism of him as of those whose sermons seem but pale reflections of the news of the week, with a dash of religious flavouring!) What I wish to convey is that Simeon refused to be cribbed, cabined, and confined within the bounds of any system, be that system Calvinist or Arminian. He held too broad a view of Scripture to allow of that. "The Author is no friend to systematizers in Theology" (Preface to *Horae Homileticae,* I, xxiii). Nor would he confine himself simply to *doctrinal* preaching, vast as that subject is. With it he combined *ethical* preaching (ibid., xxv). The theological climates of Simeon's day and of our own differ very widely the one from the other. Nevertheless one cannot but think that had his ministry been set in our own times there would have been much in the revival of Biblical theology of which he would have warmly approved, and not least in the "synthetic" approach to the Biblical doctrines which has ensued upon the "analytical" period, and in the emphasis on the double strand of *kerygma* and *didache,* to the appreciation of which C. H. Dodd gave such impetus in *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments* (1936).

Simeon was happier in the atmosphere of "Both–And", rather than in the stuffier atmosphere of "Either–Or". One cannot refrain from quoting his famous dictum: "The truth is *not in the middle,* and *not in one extreme; but in both extremes*", a saying which Canon Charles Smyth describes as a grand discovery of Simeon's, "so naturally disconcerting to the English mind" (*Simeon and Church Order,* p. 185).

For half a century and more Simeon, to use his own words, was "content to sit as a *learner* at the feet of the holy Apostles, and" had "no ambition to teach them how they ought to have spoken" (Preface to *Horae Homileticae,* I, xxiv). For fifty years and more, the main themes of his prayer and meditation were the great Biblical themes. It is this that accounts for the freshness which one still senses about the sermons of Simeon, however much one may doubt whether to-day they would have the effect that they had a century and a half ago.

The *fourth* factor was *the strength of his churchmanship.* No man with such an experience of personal conversion as Simeon had could fail to emphasize in his preaching and in his pastoral work the necessity of the individual's response to redeeming love. This

Simeon constantly did, but never to the detriment of his emphasis on the corporate aspect of the faith. He was proud and glad to be a member of the Church of England. So Moule writes: "As regards the Church of England, his dearly beloved Mother Church, he has proved himself one of its truest servants and most effectual defenders. . . . He loved ancient order and solemn ordinances, and he magnified the office of the Christian ministry. . . . The Evangelical revival of the eighteenth century found a certain defect supplied in the school of Simeon. Its earlier leaders, with really few exceptions, were by no means careless of the essential sacredness of order and cohesion: but they found themselves often in circumstances where at least there seemed to be a 'a need of disorder'. Simeon, one with them in main spiritual principles, always in quest, like them, of individual conversions, was led both by his situation and his reflections to a more distinct sense than most of them had felt of the claims of corporate and of national religious life" (H. C. G. Moule, *Charles Simeon*, pp. 259 and 260). "Never certainly did Simeon fail in loyalty to the objectivity, not only of the written Word of God, but of the historic Ministry and Sacraments" (ibid., p. 108). Such a sentence as the following, recorded by Canon A. W. Brown (*Recollections of Simeon's Conversation Parties*, p. 89), is noteworthy: "In pronouncing it (the Benediction), I do not do it as a mere finale, but I feel that I am actually dispensing peace from God, and at God's command. I know not the individuals to whom my benediction is a blessing; but I know that I am the appointed instrument by whom God is conveying the blessing to those who are able to receive it."

No one who reads, for example, Simeon's four sermons on "The Excellency of the Liturgy" can fail to realize how profoundly his churchmanship affected his preaching (*Horae Homileticae*, II, Nos. 191–194, sermons preached before the University of Cambridge).

No review of Charles Simeon as a preacher can be allowed to conclude without a reference to a *fifth factor*—namely, *his revival of the formal sermon-scheme*. Canon Charles Smyth describes this as his "most noteworthy achievement" (*The Art of Preaching*, p. 178). Year in, year out, he expounded to successive generations of undergraduates the idea of a scheme or structural framework in the construction of the sermon. The twenty-one volumes of "skeletons" are the monument of Simeon's reintroduction of one of the main characteristics of medieval preaching. His fresh translation of Jean Claude's "Essay on the Composition of a Sermon", which forms the conclusion to the last volume of *Horae Homileticae*, shows his indebtedness to the seventeenth-century minister of the French Reformed Church at Charenton.

It cannot be doubted that this fifth factor, though in a sense a technical one relating more specifically to the *art* of preaching than do some of the former factors, was nevertheless one of great importance. Too many sermons, like the primeval chaos, are "without form and void". Simeon confessed that for the first seven of his preaching years "he did not know the head from the tail of a sermon" (A. W.

Brown, *Recollections*, p. 178). Until that at least is learnt, it may be doubted how much is achieved by homiletic meandering. "Preaching", writes a modern American preacher (H. S. Coffin, in *What to Preach*, p. 155) "proposes to make men different". It is very difficult to achieve this aim if there be no clearly defined plan on the basis of which the sermon is built.

"If his *Horae Homileticae* are to-day as dead as a door-nail," writes Canon Charles Smyth (op. cit., p. 175), "the maxims which he inculcated at his Sermon Parties on alternate Friday evenings during Term are still exceedingly alive." We would go further. Simeon has something of importance to say to the preacher of this age and of every age, because the principles on which he based his preaching are principles that a preacher of any age neglects at his peril. The preacher of *every* age must take heed to himself, to his aim, to the range of his themes, to the strength of his churchmanship, and, not least, to the form in which he couches what he has to say. When that is done, we may look for a revival in our pulpit ministry.

F. D. Coggan.

The Ministry in Scripture and Tradition with Reference to Church Union

Where there is mutual recognition of the ministries in two or more denominations, intercommunion presents no difficulty and organic union becomes a possibility. The differing conceptions of the ministry in divided Christendom constitute, therefore, one of the most pressing theological issues which lie before the Ecumenical Movement. The doctrine of the ministry cannot ultimately be considered in isolation, and it may be that the theological differences, which have surrounded it and which constitute the most obtrusive obstacles to Church Union at the present time, have their roots in more radical divisions of thought concerning the nature of God and his work in human history.

This essay is an attempt to discover what light Scripture throws on certain aspects of the Church's ministry and to suggest their relevance to the movement towards union of the Church. In order, however, to avoid being involved in prolegomena concerning God's nature, his mode of revelation in Scripture, and the manner of his working in the life of the Church, it is necessary to assume without argument the widely accepted view of Scriptural revelation—that it consists, not of dogmatic propositions, but of the record of a certain series of historical events and the human response to them as revealing the divine character and purpose in human history. We shall not then expect to find in Scripture a clearly defined doctrine of the ministry, but rather a series of historical events which indicate to those who are guided by the Holy Spirit to interpret them aright, the nature and part of the ministry in the divine plan for the Church.

Closely related to the problem of the ministry, and revealing much the same lines of cleavage between "Catholic" and Protestant, is the question of the authority of Tradition in relation to that of Scripture. In this connexion the writer has one suggestion to make which may be relevant to our subject. If the nature of Scriptural revelation is the showing forth of God's character and purpose through the events of the history of Israel, while revelation through the Old Israel may be presumed to have come to an end in Christ, there is no reason why we should assume that revelation through the history of the New Israel which is the Church must have come to an end with the formation of the New Testament canon. Indeed, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit which emerges from the New Testament revelation would seem to preclude us from this assumption. We shall expect, however, that this continued revelation in Tradition—i.e. the common life and teaching of the Church—will conform to the pattern of God's working as seen in Scripture, namely that it will consist primarily of historical events and processes and of the *communis sensus fidelium* in respect of them, rather than of propositions in the form of creed or dogma and a formulated liturgical and ministerial order. These latter will naturally be counted amongst the more important historical events and processes through which revelation is mediated; they are also the record of the response of believers to the divine revelation. But the point which needs to be emphasized is that, if the pattern of revelation in Scripture and Tradition is the same, a dogma or a rule of Church order can never be the thing revealed, but only a witness to or expression of the revelation. It can never therefore be finally authoritative or unalterable in form for the life of the Church. Moreover the Fourth Gospel's teaching concerning the Spirit, that he will glorify Christ by taking of his and showing it unto us, must ever be borne in mind. Revelation through Church history can only be secondary to and dependent upon the central event or series of events of revelation which are enshrined in the Gospels. In this connexion, too, Dr Karl Barth's stress on the importance of the work of the Holy Spirit in our apprehension of Scriptural revelation needs to be applied to our interpretation of the meaning of Tradition. A literal and unthinking adherence to Tradition is parallel to Biblical fundamentalism.

To sum up this view, then, Tradition or ecclesiastical revelation may be set beside Biblical revelation; but just as it is now widely agreed to be right not to set all Scripture on the same level, but to discern the inspiration of individual passages and books only in relation to the central revelation in Christ, so too the New Testament emphasis on the close relation of the Spirit's operation in the Church to the prior and all-regulative work of Christ should guard us against ascribing to Tradition an independent authority of its own apart from the revelation of Christ in the New Testament. Rather Tradition will need to be examined and tested at every point to discern and prove its relation to Christ.

Secondly, just as we have seen that Scripture is more than the

Shema and the priestly code and contains a striking series of historical events in which through crisis after crisis God's mercy and judgment are revealed, leading up to the supreme crisis of Calvary, so too Ecclesiastical Tradition should be conceived of as consisting not only of dogma, creed, liturgy, and priestly succession. The events too, of Church history, its persecutions, its triumphs, its periods of disruption and decline, the working both of God's judgment and his renewing power in schism and reformation, the movements towards unity and, above all, the missionary expansion of Christianity—all these should be regarded by a Spirit-guided interpretation as intergral parts of the Tradition which is the medium of revelation.

When, therefore, we apply this concept of revelation through Tradition to the ministry we shall not be able to settle the matter either by a theory that the commission of the *shaliach* has been handed down through the episcopate to the present day or by saying that, because episcopacy held the field from the second century to the sixteenth and has continued in the greater part of Christendom until now, it must therefore be the "Catholic" order of the Ministry and the only possible one for the "coming great Church". We need to take into account the presbyterian strain in the thought of Jerome and several medieval writers as equally part of the Catholic Tradition. Above all the Reformation and the discontinuous ministries which emerged from it must be regarded by those who glory in them and those who deplore them alike as primary historical events through which God has spoken in judgment and in salvation.

In all this a homology (in the use of this word to which Dr Phythian Adams has introduced us) or similarity of pattern can be discerned between the ministry in the Old Testament and the ministry in both New Testament and Church history regarded together. It is easy enough to demonstrate the thread of continuity which runs through both the ministry of the old Israel and of the new. But there are other aspects of the case which we are frequently in danger of neglecting. In the first place, God seems to permit and bless a great deal more variety in the concrete expression of the patterns of his working than we with our limited human understanding are prepared to give him credit for. And to this may be added a suggestion that there is evidence in the Bible and in Church history that God sometimes delights to work through the discontinuous and the unexpected and even through persons and institutions whose authenticity is in doubt; e.g., it is a significant fact that the authorship of the majority of the books of the Bible is uncertain. Few, if any, of the great prophets belonged to the recognized prophetic schools. Above all, the genealogy of the Jerusalem priesthood is notoriously spurious. There would seem to have been a new departure in the time of David with the appointment of Zadok and probably another break during the exile, if the theory that the sons of Zadok and the sons of Aaron are different families be accepted. The rise of the Hasmonean dynasty, too, resulted in a discontinuity in the tenure of the high-priestly office. The belief in a divine ap-

pointment at Sinai and a continuous succession from the time of the exodus would appear to be a later dogma rather than a historical fact.

It has, however, its relevance for us in demonstrating the concern of later Hebrew thought to assert the divine appointment of Israel's ministry and the age-long oneness of Israel's life. So too the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession, in so far as it fails to take into account the variety of practice in the early Church or to come to terms with the Reformation, cannot be regarded as purely historical in its basis. It is rather to be treated—and even believed in—as a myth. It is not, of course, a fictitious pagan myth, but a Christian one, after the manner of the myths of the creation and the fall. It has its ground in history and may be regulative of the historical pattern of the Church's order, through its symbolizing in the dogma of a continuous ministry the Church's unity with the faithful of every age. But ultimately it must be regarded as transcending history and defying exactness or strict uniformity of interpretation or expression.

In Christ there is a new creation; and the ministry of the New Testament cannot be confined within the limits of the old. Yet that the same God has been creative and active in both is surely indicated by the manifest parallels between the characteristics of Israel's ministry and the Christian ministry, as indicated above. Further, in accordance with the fundamental principle enunciated earlier in this essay, that revelation through Scripture and Tradition cannot stand independently, but must at every point be closely related to the central revelation in Christ, may we not say that the evidence that God does not always choose the continuous and authentic through which to speak his message is part of the pattern of his working who, when he himself came to live as man amongst men, rejected what men expected of the Messiah as temptations of the devil and chose to be born out of wedlock, thus submitting himself to the suspicion of illegitimacy? We must remember, too, in this connexion that his high-priesthood from which all our ministries claim to be derived was "without father, without mother, and without genealogy".

Again, Scripture and Church history appear to agree in asserting the truth that time and again God chooses to chasten, or even supersede, his own appointed orders and institutions, either because they have become corrupt or because they have been exalted by men into an idolatry. Cases in point are the doom pronounced on the house of Eli and the more awful doom which overtook Jerusalem more than once.

This dual theme of divine appointment coupled and contrasted with divine judgment finds its most intense and dynamic expression in the Matthean form of our Lord's commission to Peter in which the words "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church", and the condemnation, "Get thee behind me, Satan, for thou savourest not the things that be of God but the things that be of men", stand side by side. The relevance of this to the crises of Church history and especially to the Reformation cannot be gain-

said. The late Sir Edwyn Hoskyns used to tell his students that it would have been more appropriate if the latter verse too had been inscribed on the dome of St Peter's, Rome, instead of only the former.

But God's final word in Revelation is not that of judgment and separation, but towards the inclusion of all his sheep in the same flock so that there may be one church, one faith, one Lord. Our examination, however, of the way of his working in the past, would suggest that in the Ecumenical Movement, which prays and works that this God-willed unity may be realized, we must not expect that the Holy Spirit will necessarily guide the Church order of the future to conform strictly to the pattern of the past. Certain fundamental principles will have to be preserved, but, in accordance with the varieties and contrasts of Scripture and Tradition, they may have varying embodiment in varying conditions.

In this respect we perhaps ought to take to heart the principle which has been freshly stated both in theory and in practice by the priests of the Roman Catholic *Mission de Paris* and elsewhere on the Continent—namely, that of accommodation to a given *milieu*. This principle is not, of course, new: it has always lain at the heart of the Church's expansion. In particular the significance of the Pauline and Johannine writings in the New Testament lies partly in the fact that they are the work of Jews who were sufficiently aware of contemporary life and thought outside Judaism to be able successfully to transpose Christianity from a Jewish to a Hellenistic *milieu*, while retaining intact the essence of Christian revelation.

To apply this to the present situation of the divided Church, it may be some time before our Roman Catholic brethren come to admit, as we ought to admit, that there are confessional or denominational *milieus*, as well as social and economic ones; and that, just as it is folly to turn proletarian converts into conventional bourgeois Catholics who will have no further influence on their mates in factory and dock, so too it is useless to attempt to achieve catholic unity by luring Protestants as individuals from their confessional *milieu* to a Roman one.

Rather unity must be sought by a kind of extension of the orthodox principle of economy; that is by leaving the different confessions intact at the start in their different *milieus* which have grown up as the result of various factors in the past—cultural and social factors as well as dogmatic and ecclesiastical. And just as it is hoped by Abbé Michonneau and others that their proletarian converts will eventually have a salutary influence on the Catholic bourgeoisie, so too the different denominational *milieus* may react beneficially on each other within the unity of a single church. There may be tension and contrast between them: indeed, the lessons we have learnt from Biblical and ecclesiastical history suggest that there will be. But by accepting the tension, and determining both in face of it and in recognition of it to live and grow together, we may hope to be used by God to bring about a higher synthesis.

To those who would object, "Do we make Catholic order of none

effect through our schemes of union?" we must reply in Pauline fashion, "Nay, we establish Catholic Order." Just as the effect of the impact of the Gospel on the Jewish law was to bring about its dissolution, so that the supreme ethic of loving God and one's neighbour, of which the law had been a defective and transient expression, might be shown forth in "a more excellent way", so too "Catholic Order" has undergone in the past, and will again in the future undergo, transformations, such as St Paul himself would doubtless have compared to death and resurrection, in order that true Catholicity may remain established.

T. S. Garrett.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. M. E. Dahl is Priest-in-charge of St Oswald's Church, Croxley Green.

The Rev. J. L. C. Dart served for twenty-three years in India and was a Canon of Bombay Cathedral. He is now Chaplain at St Mary's Abbey, West Malling. Mr Dart writes: "I am entitled to place after my signature the letters, P.M., P.D.G.C.(Bombay), P.A.G.C.(England), P.D.G.S.(Bombay), M.M.M., K.R.C.C., K.T., P.M.W.S., 30°. That gaggle of letters will not mean much to most readers, but at least it indicates that I know what I am talking about."

Dr Coggan is Principal of the London College of Divinity.

The Rev. T. S. Garrett is Vice-Principal of Tirunelveli Theological College, S. India.

CORRESPONDENCE

SHOULD A CHRISTIAN BE A FREEMASON?

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

English Freemasonry is based on a legend and a myth, and the legend is as full of errors and false doctrine as a Christmas pantomime, but I have yet to meet the Freemason who takes the legend any more seriously than as a peg on which to hang an ethical code, and the basis of a ritual which many find beautiful and uplifting. There is about it nothing of the esoteric religion, and a good Churchman can be and often is a very good Freemason. The whole ethos is steeped in a pleasant if rather Pelagian Englishry.

But what the Freemason does take very seriously indeed is the preservation of the secrets of his Craft, especially the grips and words that enable a man to show that he is a Freemason.

Mr Hannah has seen fit to publish to the world what he conceives to be some of those secrets, although he does not hint that they have the slightest bearing on his charge of heresy. Why, then, this act of so great discourtesy to a large body of his fellow-countrymen?

Does he not realize that whoever filled in the blanks in his Ritual

Book was doing one of two things: either breaking an obligation freely given, or (dare I suggest it?) deceiving your contributor? In either case it makes strange reading in a periodical to which one looks for guidance and inspiration.

Yours sincerely,

J. MACGREGOR LEWIS.

ST MARK'S VICARAGE,
103, COBURG ROAD,
LONDON, S.E.5.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The article on Freemasonry is most valuable, and demands very careful examination. Masonry is very widespread, and has a very strong hold on its members. If the figures of membership were published it would astonish many people. There can I think be no doubt about the facts as stated in this article, the secrecy surrounding it is greatly exaggerated, as indeed the article shows. One thing I am sure is urgent—namely, that every priest and every ordination candidate should be fully informed on this matter. Many who join do so under a complete misapprehension. As the writers says:

"The well-known presence of bishops and other clergymen at lodge meetings has lulled the apprehensions of the average non-Mason into a widely accepted belief that Freemasonry is no more than a benevolent society, full of sociability and high moral principles, with a few probably trivial secrets thrown in for excitement.

"And let it be frankly admitted that many, perhaps the majority of, Freemasons who are initiated, passed, and raised to the third degree of Master Masonry in the perfecty good faith which so often goes with muddled theological thinking, are also unaware that there is anything more in it than this. The actual secrets *are* for the most part trivial, and the esoteric moral symbolisms of geometry, astronomy, architecture, and the working tools of the operative stonemason, seem to the brethren to be in no way incompatible with, but rather supplementary to (though all too often they are substitutes for), a belief in the Christian Gospel."

This is certainly true: the ordinary Englishman does not take "mysteries" seriously; he is Pelagian at heart. This is so obvious in Masonic circles that even when joined, a priest who himself sees elements that disturb him is lulled to serenity. With no official support, and realizing that a very embarrassing situation will be produced by an avowed condemnation which will not be understood by those unfamiliar with Gnosticism, he continues. Indeed, he may well feel (perhaps wrongly) that his presence is the one check upon its becoming in fact an alternative religion. He is almost always invited to act as chaplain, and his avowed Christianity, he may feel, encourages a specifically Christian interpretation to the name of God. I do not say this attitude is right, it may be the rationalization of an embarrassing situation. Yet it may be an over-simplification to dismiss it as such.

A need for a very careful consideration of the whole situation is most urgent. This article shows that the secrecy is not such as to prevent such an examination. As your article points out, before the oath is taken the initiate is assured the oaths are "in no way incompatible with your moral, your civil, or your religious duties". Undoubtedly such statements are normally made in good faith; if however they are incorrect, quite obviously the candidate is released from his oath *ipso facto*.

It should be realized that most Masons are quite unfamiliar with such writings as "Masonic Symbolism and the Mystic Way" and "The Ceremony of Initiation". They would not understand them if they read them, and would dismiss them, rather as many Anglicans would the writings of Dr Barnes. This is not to dispute the truth of this article or the seriousness of the situation. Yet they are factors to take into consideration when dealing with it. It would be difficult to convince most Masons that the authors of such books were more than cranks, though in fact they are a real danger. They fall back on the avowal that "Masonry is not a religion". Certain elements in Masonry impress its members very strongly, particularly the spirit of goodwill and brotherhood. They will compare it with what they find in church life, to the detriment of the latter. Superficially this appears so, and convincingly so. It does in fact present a direct challenge to Christians. On the whole it does have a "morally uplifting" effect on many members. Yet it is superficial. Masonry is carried on in a rarefied atmosphere, such as church life is not. It demands only what the member cares to give. It is cushioned with plenty of money. An excellent meal, with alcohol to stimulate goodwill, follows all ceremonies. Controversial subjects, "religion and politics", are barred. The members are all men, and men of a similar station in life; the subscription demands that. Compared with the almost "rough-and-tumble" fellowship of an active parish, embracing all ages, both sexes, and very different stations in life, the atmosphere of Masonry is very artificial. Yet it is none the less impressive, particularly when normally the artificial atmosphere is not analysed or realized.

Before rushing into mere condemnation all factors must be borne in mind, though they must not obscure the truth of the article. Mere condemnation will not get far; there are as many Methodists as Anglicans in Masonry, despite their condemnation. The popularity of Freemasonry exists primarily because of the weakness of Christianity and the limited approach to worship in much of the Anglican Church. The abolition of Guilds, intimately a part of the Church, opened the floodgates to Freemasonry. Far too many Anglicans have been brought up on a "talking" religion, with worship limited to Matins and an occasional said "Holy Communion". They are starved for worship and the power of symbolic ceremonial to awaken the heart. It is the poverty of Anglican worship and teaching that is the primary cause of this increase of modern Gnosticism. Great care must be given to facing a very serious situation.

Heresy hunting is often a dubious pastime; the Church should

look to her teaching, and look to the standard of her worship: those are her weapons. I still insist, however, that clergy should have direction and information from the authorities of the Church.

Yours faithfully,

A Parish Priest.

TENT-MAKERS

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

May I offer some footnotes (I hope that he may be prepared to accept them as such) to Mr Chadwick's admirable statement of the case for part-time non-professional clergy to supplement the efforts of the professionals. The situation is indeed urgent. The Archdeacon of Nottingham has told us that "the annual replacement need of the Church is 600, and that for the next few years it does not seem that more than 400 per annum will be ordained" (Theology, July, 1950). Accepting these figures, one finds oneself wondering what a deficit of 200 (i.e., a third of the number required), even during what are optimistically described as a few years, is going to mean to a system which is already being kept going only by the labours of retired clergymen and of clergymen who, because they cannot find houses to live in, cannot retire. Already it would be possible to write an interesting but scandalous article on the negligible pastoral oversight now perforce given to many parishes while the incumbent is ill or during a vacancy. As to the question of providing opportunities of public worship (it seems to be assumed that in this all is well), such complacency is almost embittering to one who in a large urban deanery has spent not a few Saturdays feverishly trying to rearrange duties so that the parishioners of some sick neighbour may not be deprived of the sacraments next day.

But how, believing in the providence of God, are we to interpret this state of affairs? Is it mere plight or is it opportunity? Is it altogether condemnation or is it call? We may believe that condemnation enters into it. God's Church has during many centuries become altogether too much professionalized, and we in the Church of England are obsessed with a myth, a compound of the novels of Mr Trollope and the life-work of Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, who was a great and beneficent man, but who lived in times very different from our own. In the forefront of this myth stands the type, English clergyman. Thus to reproduce and provide for approximations to him (an undertaking in which our public has already shown a decisive lack of interest) and to find the means by which each of them may make a show of doing what three of him used to do becomes the mainspring of our policy.

It is a cruel policy, for it cannot be maintained for another fortnight save by wasting and exploiting those subjected to it, but, more than that, may we not be vainly shoring up a system that God is knocking down? Is he not calling us to something bolder and more

imaginative than mere maintenance? It comes to this— is it necessary to be a clergyman in order to be a priest? In all the arguments about an essential ministry nothing has emerged which suggests that professionalism is of the essence. A vista opens up in which may be seen not only a Church maintained, but a healthier Church, an ecclesia which has ceased to be a preserve of ecclesiastics. It is the basic questions that now demand to be answered. What is a priest? Most of all perhaps, what is a deacon?

We say that God has appointed divers orders in his Church, but one of them has become a mere token. Now, this is significant, for it is exactly about their involvement in what were once the functions of the deacons that bishops and priests are now found complaining. Yet *vis à vis* the welfare State a great deal of administration is inevitable, and to despise it is certainly unscriptural. Whether or no any of the developed orders was nascent in the Seven of the Book of Acts, it is clear that they were ordained to serving tables as a holy function. A revived and permanent diaconate is, in fact, one of our crying needs. It would have its own functions, including its liturgical functions (thus linking administration with public worship), and these would be distinct from, but not less honourable than, those of the presbyters. The question of a permanent diaconate should be considered in separation from the quite different question of a non-professional priesthood.

As to the latter, is it not strange that we should be comparatively little concerned who ascends the pulpit while we continue to suppose that a university degree or its equivalent is essential before one may be ordained to the order which allows one to ascend to the altar. "Anybody", said Origen (quoted by Père Daniélou, THEOLOGY, January 1951), "can carry out the solemn office of the liturgy before the people, but few men are instructed in doctrine and able to impart knowledge of the faith". We seem to have exactly reversed that situation, and it would be difficult to maintain that our arrangements are the more intelligent.

But it is said that we shall produce a class of mere service-takers. It is not easy to see why anybody, who knows anything of the varied work being undertaken by readers, should at this date expect this to be so. But in any case a great deal of pastoral work, once the almost exclusive province of the professional clergy, is now carried out by others, and what could be more edifying than the sight of (for example) a Christian probation officer, whose daily work is to seek and to save, presiding at the Sunday Eucharist. Not indeed that the priesthood should be confined to the black-coated, but the argument stated at the beginning of this paragraph is surely due to a restricted and out-dated conception of pastoral work.

Certainly a strong cadre of full-time professional clergy will always be needed and, in passing, ought not the probabilities of the future to have some effect upon the character of their training? But God calls us back to the fundamentals, to something more creative than making shift and bolstering up, to a less timid response to the problems which in his mercy he presents to us. Barchester was an

engaging place, but we are not living in Barchester. One of our greatest dangers is that we may so easily become a period piece.

Yours faithfully,

FRANK BENNETT.

THE RECTORY, WIGAN,
6 *February*, 1951.

THE DAUGHTER OF ZION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

In reply to my remarks about the Archangel's salutation, Fr Hebert simply asserts that "St Luke was far more sensitive to Biblical themes than he was supposed to be by the scholars of the last generation". I do not think this meets the difficulty that Theophilus and the other readers of the Gospel would naturally understand χαῖρε as a conventional greeting. If they were to take it otherwise, would not St Luke have been bound to give them a less ambiguous clue?

As for the Magnificat, Elizabeth has been speaking from 1. 42 onwards. If at 1. 46 the evangelist merely wrote καὶ εἶπεν . . ., one must surely infer, in the absence of any contrary evidence, that Elizabeth is still the subject. Compare the connexion at 15. 11, where *Εἶπεν δέ* . . . in the middle of a discourse introduces another parable. Moreover, since at 1. 46 Zacharias has not yet uttered the Benedictus, the reader has no *a priori* grounds for supposing that, in order to maintain the parallel between the father of the Baptist and the mother of the Lord, the Magnificat must belong to the latter.

I must confess, therefore, that I do not think Fr Hebert's letter has strengthened his case at either of his key-points.

Yours faithfully,

H. J. M. TURNER.

c/o CROSBY VICARAGE,
SCUNTHORPE,
3 *February*, 1951.

Father Hebert writes:

I do not think that Mr Turner has at all done justice to the objections that can be urged against the "Daughter of Zion" thesis. Why did he not point out (as was suggested to me after the article appeared) that neither Matthew nor John, when quoting Zech. 9. 9 in reference to the triumphal entry, includes the word χαῖρε, which according to the thesis was a word of some importance in the early Church? (I must admit that the thesis would be considerably strengthened if either or both of them had done so.) Again, he might have drawn a parallel with Samuel and David; as Samuel anointed David, so John baptized Jesus, and Samuel's mother has her *Magnificat* in 1 Sam. 2. (But I see no sign that either Luke or the author of the original Hebrew or Aramaic nativity-narrative had this parallel in mind.) I think that some of the interpretations in my

article are in themselves highly disputable, as he said in his former letter. But I thought then, and still think, that the two key-points—the translation of χαῖρε as "rejoice", and the *Magnificat* as the song of Mary speaking as Daughter of Zion—stand firm enough to render the other interpretations probable.

In interpreting the N.T., we must think ourselves back into the thought-world of the first century; and Mr Turner must not imagine to himself a modern-minded Theophilus. The real Theophilus and his kind were expected to grasp continual O.T. allusions; the Palestinian readers of the original Semitic nativity-narrative would see them at once. That narrative as a whole is about the birth of the Messiah-King promised in O.T.: what more natural than that the word χαῖρε should at once evoke the texts in which the Daughter of Zion had been bidden to rejoice in the hope of his coming?

He wants to interpret καὶ εἶπεν in 1. 46 (taking this as the original reading) according to strict grammar, and so attribute *Magnificat* to Elizabeth: this of course led to the addition of her name in some Old Latin texts. But the fact that the words of the *Magnificat* itself are appropriate only to the mother of the Messiah is sufficient, surely, to show what St Luke meant. And as for "the parallel between the father of the Baptist and the mother of the Lord", it is necessary to consider, not how it might be understood by one reading the chapter for the first time, but how the run of the chapter as a whole was conceived in the mind of the person who wrote it.

[This correspondence is now closed.—Ed. Theology.]

BOOK REVIEWS

The Origins of the Austin Canons and their Introduction into England. By J. C. Dickinson. S.P.C.K. 20s.

In his preface Mr Dickinson describes the Austin Canons as "the most neglected religious order of the medieval church". How true this statement is becomes apparent when we learn that the only really detailed study of the early history of the regular canons is the *Vetus disciplina canonicorum regularium et secularium* of Eusebius Amort, published at Venice in 1747, and that, for the rest, resort must be had to information scattered among a number of articles and monographs. Mr Dickinson has, therefore, performed a valuable service to scholarship in giving us, in such attractive form, the results of his investigations, the work of several years, into the origins of the Austin Canons and their introduction into England. The importance of such an investigation is brought home to us when we learn that in the early thirteenth century the order had more houses in England than any of the strictly monastic orders. Technically, the canons ranked as *clerici* as distinct from *monachi*, though their living of the full common life, their adoption of a rule, and their concentration on divine worship and contemplation made it difficult to distinguish them from monks. Their observances are fully discussed by Mr Dickinson, also the important question of the extent

to which the canons served parish churches in person. On this latter point, his conclusion is that while there were "good and sufficient reasons for regular canons availing themselves but seldom of the opportunities they had for serving parish churches in person, their right to do so when they so desired, providing certain safeguards were observed, was scarcely in doubt in official circles". In 1100 the Council of Poitiers had enacted "that regular clerks could, with their bishop's consent, baptize, preach, give penance, and bury the dead". In the twelfth century, the regular canons in England received gifts of churches in great numbers, but even if they had wished to do so, they could not possibly have sent priests from their order to serve more than the merest fraction of such churches. Where there was a parochial altar in their own conventual church or near it, they may have served it occasionally, but the care of a parish and the cure of souls were not their real business, and there is no evidence that they were expected to perform such duties on a larger scale than they felt necessary or possible.

I have no space to outline here Mr Dickinson's admirably clear and valuable discussion of the Rule of St Augustine, or to summarize his important remarks on the intimate connexion of the regular canons with the Gregorian Reform and its leaders. He gives as well a brief account of learning in the order in the twelfth century. The great Alexander Neckham was an Augustinian, and the house of St Frideswide at Oxford is connected with the origins of the university. If the story of the Augustinian contribution to piety and learning were continued to the fourteenth century, it would include the great name of Walter Hilton of Thurgarton, the author of the *Scale of Perfection*, a mystical treatise which had a great influence in its own time and later.

Mr Dickinson's book is a work which will be of great value to scholars, but it will interest as well the less learned visitor to the ruins of St Botolph's, Colchester, or of Guisborough, to Carlisle Cathedral or to Lanercost, to St Bartholomew, Smithfield, or to Cartmel, who wonders what manner of men it was who built these imposing churches and lived and died in their shadow.

F. J. E. Raby.

Jesus College, Cambridge.

Medieval Papalism. By Walter Ullmann. Methuen. 18s.

Much has been written in recent years, in the pages of Theology as elsewhere, upon the alleged subservience of the Reformers, and of Luther in particular, to temporal rulers. It is a pity that Dr Ullmann's book was not available when this discussion was at its height, to remind the protagonists of the political theories from which the Reformers were reacting. The medieval papacy was before all else a political power: it was therefore impossible to discuss religion, or to purge it, in isolation from politics, law, and princes. And if, as Dr Ullmann clearly shows, canonists had for three hundred years been teaching that there can be only one sort and seat of

sovereignty in an earthly realm, it is no wonder that the half-emancipated Luther should still make room for only one, the prince instead of the priest. The wonder is that such dualistic constitutions as, for instance, the English and Scottish ecclesiastical establishments could emerge at all.

Medieval Papalism contains the Maitland Memorial Lectures for 1948; its sub-title, *The Political Theories of the Medieval Canonists*, exactly defines its contents. It is a study of glosses and commentaries on the component parts of the Corpus Iuris Canonici, some in manuscript, others, about two dozen, in early and rare printed editions. The reading and collation of material involved in its preparation must have been immense. The first chapter is a survey of this material, and of the all-embracing scope of canon law in medieval society. The canonists stood behind the popes their pupils, staking for them new claims, justifying in advance each extension of papal power. Even institutions like the English Parliament whose love for the canonists was least, could not escape the influence of principles derived from the canon and civil laws.

The next two chapters discuss natural law. The canonists with one voice proclaimed it immutable; the popes, using the dispensing powers which the canonists gave them, rendered this immutability "but a hollow name". "The pope can do whatever God can do"; therefore he is above all laws, human and divine, and his power of dispensing from them is limited only when they are classed as definitions of faith, like the decrees of the first four General Councils. The basis of this plenitude of power, examined in Chapter IV, was Scripture and the philosophy of Aristotle, especially the *De Anima*, fortified by appeals to historical events real and imagined. Anti-papalists, incidentally, started from the same premises, and accepted roughly the same historical events; it was by dialectic that the two parties reached such diverse conclusions.

On the world government of the pope—*Dominus mundi*, vicar and indeed succeessor of God—and his superiority to the Emperor, Dr Ullmann's exposition is at its best. The pope's dominion is co-extensive with God's, and co-equal. The crusades were a stepping-stone in the direction of establishing his world dominion. Until the end of the twelfth century the canonist was content to share with the civilian the conception, derived from Justinian, of the *sacerdotium* and the *imperium* as the twin pillars of society, the *respublica christiana*. Hugguccio, master of Innocent III, taught this view; for him, the coronation of the emperor had no constitutive effect; it was simply a formality which changed the title to imperial power; and that power was derived, not from the pope, but from the electoral college of princes. But an Englishman, Alanus, dazzled by the pontificate of Innocent III, led the papalists towards new heights. A body can have one head only—a body with two heads is a monster. The head must be the pope, the vicar of Christ who wielded both swords, and gave both to Peter and to the popes his successors. The pope has the plenitude of power, spiritual and temporal. The spiritual he wields in full himself; the temporal he delegates to the

emperor—*ultimus servus papae et ecclesiae.* The emperor has no power before he is crowned; he derives none from his election by the princes; coronation is the outward and visible act by which his dominion is conferred by the pope upon him. The pope confers upon him only such power as he does not choose to exercise himself. *Imperium dependet a papa.*

This was the theory which history, past as well as future, was to be made to serve, the theory which found expression in Boniface VIII's *Unam Sanctam,* and which the Conciliar Movement tried unsuccessfully to assail. "*Papa est stupor mundi*", wrote an English poet to Innocent III; "*nec deus es nec homo, quasi neuter es inter utrumque; . . . pater ergo vicarie Christi me totum committo tibi.*" The sentiments are not unfamiliar.

Dr Ullmann expounds the doctrine admirably, without passion; it is in the texts, and his sole concern is to bring it to light. There are minor blemishes in the book—some confusion in the Pauline epistles on p. 88, an apparently rash assumption of Eusebius as author of the history of Hadrian I, Charlemagne, and Leo VIII, on p. 173, and other misprints. But its importance in the study of medieval thought stands beyond question.

G. R. Dunstan.

Sutton Courtney,
Berkshire.

Enthusiasm. By R. A. Knox. Clarendon Press. 30s.

Monsignor Knox has been working on this book for more than thirty years and one does not know which to admire more—the boldness of the plan or the brilliance of its execution. Who would have thought it possible to treat such apparently diverse subjects as manifestations of the same underlying principles? Here we find Montanists, Donatists, Albigenses, the Catholic underworld of the Middle Ages, Anabaptists, Quakers, Jansenists, Madame Guyon, Molinos, John Wesley, the Countess of Huntingdon, even Agapemonites, considered as parts of one stream flowing through the ages. The common factor is termed ultrasupernaturalism, which includes the protest of Platonism against Aristotelianism, and reaction against institutionalism. Prophesying, speaking with tongues, etc., are an extreme example shown in those who want visible results. Many features of *Enthusiasm* are due to the abiding influence of St Augustine. It will be noticed that the book confines itself to Western Christendom; it would be too much to ask for the inclusion of the similar movements in the Eastern Church so brilliantly discussed in Holl's *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt,* but their close resemblance to those of the Celtic Church brings them into the Western orbit. I am thinking of the "soul-friends" who heard confessions, though not in orders.

The core of the book is pp. 176–355, where Jansenism, Quietism, Fénelon, and Madam Guyon are treated. These are fascinating subjects for study. Fancy an age when the controversies were concerned

with Disinterested Love, "Consolations", Frequent Communion; when Molinos was arrested by the pontifical police for errors in his teaching about prayer! Monsignor Knox pays generous tribute to Bremond, but frequently challenges his judgments. On the whole he makes out his case that Rome treated well-meaning enthusiasts gently.

The first page dealing with John Wesley is a *tour de force*, for it is phrased in terms that would equally well suit John Henry Newman. The author pokes some legitimate fun at Wesley by letting him speak for himself. It is hard to see Wesley as showing reaction from institutionalism, for the closely knit fabric of Methodism in all essentials goes back to its founder. The Countess of Huntingdon is given deserved prominence.

"Enthusiasm" to-day is under a cloud. Monsignor Knox even suggests that he may be describing a closed chapter of history. "Experience" has proved a weak support for Christian truth; perhaps modern men, nourished by the radio and the cinema, have become impervious to revivalism.

In conclusion, let us express gratitude to the distinguished author for his unfailing charity towards his characters; also for treating them on a rational and theological basis without any attempt at psychoanalysis.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

Chichester.

Christianity and Physical Science. By G. D. Yarnold. Mowbrays. 8s. 6d.

In this book Dr Yarnold, writing as a scientist and as a theologian, endeavours to answer his question, "Can a scientist be a Christian?".

His opening chapter defines the fields—science and religion can both claim to be true; the truth of one does not declare the falseness of the other, because their subject-matter and their sources are different. Nevertheless the fields border upon each other, and the bulk of the book is an examination of the points of contact, which Dr Yarnold believes must be discussed at the fundamental roots of physics. For instance, science shows us the rationality of the physical world in that, once understood, the latter behaves as we expect it to behave; and morality would be impossible in a haphazard world in which we could never forecast the results of our own behaviour. With this theme cause, law, and chance, as illustrated in mechanics, thermodynamics, and radioactivity, are shown to conform to the divine purpose.

Science, however, is based upon the description of observations, and is therefore in no position to rule out real or apparent departures from uniformity. Indeed, such departures are to be expected in the activity of a personal God. On this basis the miraculous element in the New Testament is vindicated, and discussed in considerable detail, an interesting classification of the miracles, with full source references, being included.

While the scientific discussion in the book is informed and beyond criticism, the philosophical background is vague. There is hardly a hint of that return to Aristotelian and pre-Cartesian ways of thinking which is now being made by such widely different authors as Jacques Maritain and Gilbert Ryle; ways of thinking which turn many of the difficulties discussed by Dr Yarnold upside down. For instance, in finding the activity of God at the basis of physics he dismisses the chemical and biological worlds as the outcome of physics. But may not the former be as it were the building and the latter the bricks and mortar, and the finished building is not the "outcome" of the bricks. Just as the activity of the architect is *seen* in the finished building and is not to be discerned in any way in the pile of bricks, so the activity of God is *seen* in the formed universe, and is not to be found in unformed random subatomic phenomena. Again, Dr Yarnold writes of the "impersonal activity of God" in upholding natural law, and of his "personal activity" in revelation. Surely this distinction is bad. As Mr Boycott pointed out in the December THEOLOGY, the forms of nature and the forms of revealed religion must be seen as one creation. Seeing is understanding, and this understanding, following the derivation of the word, is the "substance", or science, of created things.

However, in his conclusions, Dr Yarnold discusses the "substance" or, as he suggests, the "value" of prayer and of the sacraments. This substance may be changed, to use his metaphor, as a signature changes the substance of a cheque. The point is developed in a final chapter which is perhaps the most telling part of this stimulating book.

ABINGDON, BERKS. GILBERT WALTON.

LETTERS OF HERBERT HENSLEY HENSON. Chosen and edited with an introduction by Evelyn Foley Braley. S.P.C.K. 15s.

After three volumes of *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life*, do we really want to know more of Bishop Hensley Henson? Canon Braley thinks so, and hundreds of others will agree with him. Why? Because Henson had a unique personality, because his English prose was perfect, because his humour was irresistible, and, above all, because he was and is so lovable. Many have felt that the *Retrospect* gave the impression that he was unyielding and devoted to controversy. The letters show that this would be an unfair statement. He was devoted to principle, and controversy often followed as a matter of course. In a review for THEOLOGY, however short, something should be said about his orthodoxy. Again and again he emphasized that his favourite text for preaching was *Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, yea and for ever* (Letter 176). As he firmly believed in the godhead of our Lord it seems strange that he could not hold the literality of the Virgin Birth as a "pious opinion", still less as a fundamental article of belief (Letter 190); and yet he could assure Archbishop Davidson, before his consecration as Bishop of Here-

ford, "That no one who sincerely worshipped Christ as Divine could postulate in His case an ordinary birth, and that I had never found any satisfying alternative to the dogma of the Virgin Birth" (*Retrospect*, Vol. I, p. 244).

The bishop was often said to be inconsistent, but the Letters make it clear that there was a gradual evolution rather than inconsistency. Take for instance two points—the Catholic position and the national Establishment. The present writer first heard him at the Shrewsbury Church Congress of 1896. A small young man, as he was, attracted great attention as a Catholic stalwart. One cannot say that he then held that without bishops there could be no Church, but it was certainly assumed that such was the case. More and more, as both *Retrospect* and Letters indicate, he was violently opposed to such a doctrine, and his strong support of Establishment was linked with his earnest wish that the schisms of the seventeenth century should be annulled and that there might again be a united Church of England. In the Lambeth Conference of 1920 he pleaded for a fuller recognition of Nonconformist ministries, and was lukewarm, or hostile, to any approaches to Rome or Constantinople. This support of Establishment came to a head in the Prayer Book controversies of 1927 and 1928, both in the House of Lords and in the Church Assembly. When the House of Commons twice threw out the new Prayer Book he became a strong supporter of Disestablishment. He has not been widely followed, for many of us felt that, delighted though we were with his speeches in the Church Assembly, we could not always agree with his views.

What a tender heart is revealed by the Letters! Messages of sympathy in bereavement are often a difficult problem, but he surmounted it with words that were true and not sanctimonious. The last Reflections (Letter 196) were dictated, but not signed, on the day of his death, 27 September 1947.

We greatly welcome this book of letters, so carefully chosen by Canon Braley from 1,450 from all parts of the world. No future author of Church History will regard as "unimportant" the three volumes of Hensley Henson's *Retrospect*, and will be glad to have the supplement of his letters, which reveal a gracious as well as a virile personality.

D. H. S. Cranage.

Winkfield.

Behold, thy King Cometh! Edited by Brother Edward. Canterbury Press. 5s.

There are signs on many sides that the doctrine of the Second Advent and all that goes with it is being called out of the limbo of harmless but irrelevant truth to meet the bewilderment of an apocalyptic age. This book is itself a welcome indication that the question of personal immortality is not the only one of the last things that interests modern Christians, and that the original eschatological scheme of the N.T. is once again being taken seriously. "It makes

the greatest possible difference", said Bishop Gore, "if our imagination becomes rightly coloured—if what we come to anticipate with assurance is not our being carried away to some other remote world, but the victory of God in the creation and world we know." As Fr G. Curtis says in the most solid of the essays under review, "Christian hope is a Messianic, militant, corporate virtue" for which "the little individual pieties which masquerade as 'acts of hope' in our modern devotional books are no adequate substitute". To say this to our generation with the fire of conviction, and perhaps of prophesy, is itself worth doing. There are many things of value in this volume—not least the Advent University Sermon by Canon Eric Abbott.

But in truth something more is needed to-day than to repeat again, "the end of all things is at hand", with whatever sincerity and sense of constraint it is done. Account must be taken of three factors without which there is little hope of penetrating contemporary scepticism. It is to be regretted that this book does not give adequate attention to any of them.

There is first of all the scientific criticism of the Bible. The editor, though conscious of his own tendency to "jump the critical hedges", assures us that most of his contributors are "men who have been through the furnace of higher criticism" and that "like the three Children, they have come forth with 'their coats and hats and their hosen unsinged, neither has the smell of fire passed over them' ". Whether they would accept this as a compliment is questionable; but it is certain that some of them must be men of asbestos minds if they can still assume without argument the traditional apostolic authorship of the Pastorals, 2 Peter, Jude, and the Apocalypse. In the Gospels, crucial verses like "This generation shall not pass away, until all these things be accomplished", and "Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come", are simply passed over. No account is taken of the important fact that the primitive *Kerygma* in Acts contains no reference to a *return* of the Messiah (Acts 3. 27 ff. says Jesus will next come as Christ after his first preparatory coming as Servant), nor of the findings of Prof. Cullmann on the earliest Christian confessions, none of which regard this element in the apostolic *Paradosis* as part of its irreducible minimum. This is not to deny the truth that the writers are trying to recover, but these things must be faced.

Secondly, practically no recognition is given to the very considerable work over recent years on the *theology* of the N.T. at this point. The inspiration of Fr Benson and Fr Puller may have meant much to the writers of this symposium, but, with all due respect, they are not substitutes for the work of such men as Dr Schweitzer and Prof. Dodd, which receives no mention whatever. The consequence is that the relation between the Incarnation and the, so called, "second" coming upon which these two have focused attention is very inadequately treated.

Lastly, it is impossible for Christians seriously to try to give a reason for the hope that is in them to-day without recognizing that

a radical reassessment is required of the nature and validity of all statement about the last things. This has never been forced on the Church as it was in the case of the first things. The beginning of such restatement as is being attempted by Prof. Niebuhr and others is again ignored. But without it the rediscovery of the eschatological thrill of the N.T., so vitally associated with all the real growing points of Church life to-day, will be stunted and frustrated. A fundamentalist approach to the myths of the last things will have as much success in commending itself to intelligent Christians and non-Christians of our age as an attempt at this hour of the day to reinstate a literal Garden of Eden, a talking serpent, and the rest.

JOHN A. T. ROBINSON.

WELLS THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE.

SHORTER NOTICES

THE CHURCH IS A FAMILY. By C. M. Parker and R. J. Hall. Independent Press. 3s. 6d.

TOMORROW'S CHURCH. By S. M. Gibbard, S.S.J.E. National Society and S.P.C.K. 6s. 6d.

Many C. of E. chaplains during the war were not a little disconcerted to discover that free-churchmen in the forces frequently had a much better knowledge of the Bible than had Anglicans. One therefore reads with interest of free-church methods of religious education.

The most impressive thing about *The Church is a Family* is that it is addressed largely to the laity, to deacons, Sunday-school teachers, and church members generally. It outlines the main features of an experiment, through sponsors or "Church Friends", to bridge the gap between youth and age in the fellowship of a congregation.

It is unfortunate that a book of just over one hundred pages should be rather repetitive, indeed often platitudinously so. But what most strikes an Anglican reviewer is what one might call the absence of the transcendental. Worship in the Catholic sense is barely touched on, and the emphasis is laid principally on human activity. The Christian festivals are indeed mentioned, but without much insight into the wonderful rhythm of the liturgical year. There seems to be little care for doctrine, and almost none at all for eucharistic worship.

Father Gibbard, on the other hand, deals with all these topics very adequately. If his book is not strikingly original it is nevertheless a most praiseworthy compendium, and should prove of considerable value to all who use it. Any priest or church worker who wishes to know of the latest and most effective methods will find them outlined here. Any vicar, arguing the pros and cons of an open or closed Scout group, or who wishes a simple guide to the 1944 Education Act, will receive satisfactory elucidation. The chapter on Conversion is particularly illuminating. The volume is of much

more enduring value than its paper cover would suggest, and we hope the publishers will issue the second edition in a worthier binding.

As is inevitable in such books, both tend occasionally to the trivial when illustrating general principles by particular instances. And both seem to assume that the work will be with large numbers, in well-equipped church halls and helped on by bands of first-rate leaders. To your single-handed country-town reviewer these are indeed Pisgah sights of a Promised Land that is still far away.

LAWRENCE WILSON.

NORTH BERWICK.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

A. AND C. BLACK: J. N. Sanders, *The Foundations of the Christian Faith* (10s. 6d.).

BURNS OATES: John Ryan, *Medical Aspects of Marriage* (published for the Catholic Marriage Advisory Council) (1s. 6d.).

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS: A. W. Blackwood, *The Preparation of Sermons* (15s.).

CHURCHMAN PUBLISHING CO.: J. E. Roscoe, *Evolution and the Virgin Birth* (1s.).

ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES PRESS: G. S. Humphreys, *Teach Yourself Letter Writer* (4s. 6d.); A. Parmelee, *A Guidebook to the Bible* (4s. 6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: E. Goudge, *God So Loved the World* (10s. 6d.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: J. Trevor Davies, *Lord of All* (7s. 6d.).

KAISER VERLAG (MUNICH): Werner Graf, *Ja und Nein* (DM. 4.80).

LONGMANS: H. A. Williams, *Jesus and the Resurrection* (2s. 6d.); A. D. Power, *Sidelights on the Book of Proverbs* (3s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: P. D. Devanandan, *The Concept of Maya* (21s.); G. Parrinder, *West African Psychology* (25s.); K. L. Reichelt, *Religion in Chinese Garment* (15s.).

MILDMAY MISSION TO THE JEWS: John Goldstein, *All the Doors were Opened* (2s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: Hugh Collet (Ed.), *Poems by Father Andrew* (5s.); Adams and Shaw, *Triumphant in Suffering* (2s. 6d.); Bede Frost, *Lent with S. Benedict* (6s.); J. Stobbart (Ed.), *The Wisdom of Evelyn Underhill* (1s. 6d); P. F. Chambers (Ed.), *The Wisdom of Mother Julian* (1s. 6d.).

NELSON: K. G. Collier, *The Science of Humanity* (12s. 6d.).

OVERDALE COLLEGE (SELLY OAK, BIRMINGHAM): William Robinson, *The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews: a Study in the Christian Doctrine of Hope* (Joseph Smith Memorial Lecture) (1s. 3d.).

HENRY REGNERY CO. (CHICAGO): William Henry Chamberlain, *America's Second Crusade* ($3.75).

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: Margaret Musson, *Prophet Harris* (3s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Anders Nygren, *The Gospel of God* (6s.).

SKEFFINGTON: J. Fletcher Ray, *The Hand that Drove the Nails* (7s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: W. E. M. Brown, *The Polished Shaft* (7s. 6d.); W. H. V. Reade, *The Christian Challenge to Philosophy* (13s. 6d.); E. Milner-White, *A Procession of Passion Prayers* (7s. 6d.).

SPEMANN: Metropolite Seraphim, *Die Osthirche* (n.p.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher